D. Mark Durcan 09/652,998 Serial No. Filing Date August 31, 2000 Group Art Unit 2814 Examiner Name Anh D. Mai 400.153US07 Attorney Docket No.

TRANSMITTAL FORM UNDER 37 CFR 1.10 (LARGE ENTITY)

Title: CONTAINER CAPACITOR STRUCTURE AND METHOD OF FORMATION THEREOF

Commissioner for Patents **BOX NON-FEE AMENDMENT** Washington, DC 20231

Enclosures

The following documents are enclosed:

 $\underline{\mathbf{X}}$ A Response to Non-Final Office Action (4 pgs.)

 \mathbf{X} A return postcard.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 501373.

CUSTOMER NUMBER 27073

Leffert Jay & Polglaze, P.A. P. O. Box 581009

Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009

	Fee Calculation			₹ ,				
	Number of Claims		Prv. Amt.	Extra Claims		Fee		Fee Paid
Total Claims		-20		0	X	\$18	=	,
Independent Claims		-3		0	X	\$84	=	
	,						=	
							Total	

Submitted By Name Reg. No. | 39,801 Telephone (612) 312-2203 Daniel I, Polglaze Date December 20, 2002 Signature

⁶Certificate of Mailing

"Express Mail" mailing label number: <u>EV256356399US</u> Date of Deposit: <u>December 20, 2002</u> These papers and fees are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

S/N 09/652,998



STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named

Inventor:

D. Mark Durcan

Examiner: Anh D. Mai

Serial No.:

09/652,998

Art Unit: 2814

Filed:

August 31, 2000

Docket: 400.153US07

Title:

CONTAINER CAPACITOR STRUCTURE AND METHOD OF FORMATION

THEREOF

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

issioner for Patents
ngton, D.C. 20231

In response to the Office Action dated September 24, 2002, Applicant responds as follows:

<u>REMARKS</u>

Objections

The Examiner objected to the amendment filed June 24, 2002, under 35 U.S.C. §132 asserting it "introduces new matter into the disclosure," and requires the applicant to cancel the new matter thusly identified. Applicant submits that the originally specification contains clear support for the amendment.

Specifically, the subject matter objected to in the Office Action is asserted by the Office Action as follows: (1) "the top capacitor plate includes a lateral clearance opening at the first level around the contact and does not vertically descend between the first, second and third bottom capacitor plates and the contact"; (2) "the bit line contact downwardly extends from a vertical height above a top of the first and second bottom electrodes" and (3) "wherein the top electrode includes a lateral clearance opening above the top of the first bottom electrode".

Taking these points in order, with respect to assertion (1), Applicant refers to page 13, lines 16-20 of the specification, which reads "[o]ne skilled in the art can now appreciate that, when a dielectric and top electrode are subsequently deposited, those layers will not deposit between a bottom electrode and its neighboring contact site ..." This text refers to Figure 8A, which also clearly shows the top capacitor plate not vertically descending, as is recited in the